|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Score | Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization | | Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence | | Conventions: Grammar and Mechanics |
| Statement of Purpose/Focus | Organization | Elaboration of Evidence | Language/Vocabulary/Style |
| 4 | The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:   * claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained * alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed\* * claim is introduced and communicated clearly within the context | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:   * effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies * logical progression of ideas from beginning to end * effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose * strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety | The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the writer's claim that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves substantial depth that is specific and relevant   * use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete * clear, explicit reasoning that shows how evidence supports claim | The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:   * use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a strong command of conventions:   * few, if any, errors are present in usage and sentence formation * effective and consistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| 3 | The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:   * claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present * context provided for the claim is adequate | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness, though there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected:   * adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety * adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end * adequate introduction and conclusion * adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas | The response provides adequate support/evidence for writer’s claim that includes the use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves some depth and specificity but is predominantly general:   * some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise * adequate use of reasoning that shows how evidence supports claim | The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language   * use of domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:   * some errors in usage and sentence formation may be present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed * adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| 2 | The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:   * may be clearly focused on the claim but is insufficiently sustained * claim on the issue may be somewhat unclear and unfocused | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:   * inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies with little variety * uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end * conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak * weak connection among ideas | The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details, and achieves little depth:   * evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven * weak use of reasoning | The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:   * use of domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:   * frequent errors in usage may obscure meaning * inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| 1 | The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant detail:   * may be very brief * may have a major drift * claim may be confusing or ambiguous | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure:   * few or no transitional strategies are evident * frequent extraneous ideas may intrude | The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details:   * use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant * claim not supported | The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:   * uses limited language or domain-specific vocabulary * may have little sense of audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:   * errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure |
| 0 | A response gets no credit if it provides no evidence of the ability to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_[fill in with key language from the intended target]. | | | | |